

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Final Office Action mailed May 19, 2006, has been carefully reviewed and this paper is Applicant's response thereto. Claims 1-33 are pending. The drawings were objected for failing to show a feature of claim 20. Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-15, 20-22 and 29-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,250,720 to Entrop *et al.* (Entrop). Claims 23-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Entrop in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,743,627 to Casteel (Casteel). Claims 3, 6-7, 10, 16 and 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being unpatentable over Entrop in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,516,197 to Yonkers *et al.* (Yonkers). In response, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in view of the remarks that follow.

Interview Summary

Applicant's representatives would like to express their appreciation for the time the Examiner took to discuss this case. The objection to the drawings was discussed and Applicant's representative indicated that the Figures were intended to show an embodiment with the aperture in the light shield going up to and including the center. However, as noted during the discussion, the physical thickness of the lines makes it difficult to show this feature more clearly than it is already shown. The Examiner indicated that given the physical limitations of drawings, this objection would be withdrawn.

Objection to the Drawings

The drawings were objected for not showing a light shield that allows a percentage of light to pass through the light shield at the center as recited in claim 20. While variations in the light shield design are contemplated, Figures 6 and 7 show an aperture in the light shield that includes the center. Applicant notes that the physical requirement for the lines on the Figures to have width makes it difficult to show a perfect match between an aperture and a center. In view of the discussion regarding the Figures, as noted above, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) - Entrop

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-15, 20-22 and 29-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Entrop. Claims 1, 20 and 29 are independent.

Independent claim 1 recites “a light shield... the light shield comprising a center, a first side having a first outer edge, a first path and a first plurality of coverage zones... wherein each coverage zone has a light blocking area corresponding to the amount of light blocked from the light source..., wherein the plurality of light blocking areas on the first side decreasing block light along the first path.” Applicant respectfully submits that Entrop fails to disclose, suggest or teach the above features. As an initial matter, the Office Action suggests that the statements provided by Applicants in the prior response do not apply because the statements are not directed to features recited in claim 1. In addition, the Office Action also stated that the claims do not recite varying light blocking.

9. Applicant argues that the light blockage of ENTROP does not vary. Notably, the feature upon which applicant relies (i.e. varying light coverage) is not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,

(Office Action of May 19, 2006, pg. 8). However, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 does include such a feature. More particularly, as can be appreciated from the highlighted portion of claim 1, the claim recites a light shield with at least two coverage zones that do not have the same light blocking areas. In contrast, the Office Action admits that the light shield of Entrop has a single coverage area of 100 percent (or one coverage area) by explaining that “a coverage zone having ‘100 percent coverage’ qualifies as a coverage zone.” (See Office Action of May 19, 2006, pg 8). Thus, it does not appear possible for Entrop to disclose the above recited features. Therefore, for at least the above reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by Entrop.

Claims 2-19 depend from claim 1 and are not anticipated for at least the above reasons and the additional features recited therein.

Independent Claim 20 recites the feature of “a zone boundary located on the light shield between the center and the outer edge, wherein a first coverage zone is located between the center and the zone boundary and a second coverage zone is located between the zone boundary and the outer edge, wherein the light blocking area of the first coverage zone is greater than the

light blocking area of the second coverage zone.” As can be appreciated from the highlighted portions of claim 20, for reasons similar to the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, claim 20 is also not anticipated by Entrop.

Claims 21-22 depend from claim 20 and are not anticipated for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 20 and for the additional features recited therein.

Independent claim 29 recites the step of “using a light shield having a center and an outer edge to decreasingly shield a percentage of the light source along a path from the center to the outer edge.” As noted above, the Office Action admits Entrop only discloses a shield with a constant 100 percent light blocking. Therefore, for reasons similar to the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, Entrop fails to disclose all the features of claim 29.

Claims 30-33 depend from claim 29 and are not anticipated by Entrop for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 29 and for the additional limitations recited therein.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Entrop and Casteel

Claims 23-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Entrop in view of Casteel. Claims 3-4, 6-7 and 16-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Entrop in view of Yonkers.

Looking first at claim 23, regarding the combination of Entrop and Casteel, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action’s combination of two completely different methods of providing light fixtures does not support the Office Action’s position. As an initial matter, the two designs function completely differently and it is unclear how one could be combined with the other. Furthermore, as previously noted, Applicant is unaware of any successful attempt to modify a design such as the design used by Entrop so that the light fixture has a thickness of less than 1.5 inches. The Office Action has provided no support (nor does any appear possible) nor pointed to any teaching in either of the references that suggests how Casteel could be used to modify Entrop to reach a light fixture that has a thickness “not more than 1.5 inches.” Rather, the disclosure of Casteel simply supports Applicant’s position that a long felt need for a thinner light fixture existed. In addition, even if the Office Action could overcome what Applicant feels

is an impossible obstacle and somehow provide some motivation for modifying Entrop with Casteel and also provide some method of doing so that would provide a person of ordinary skill in the art with an expectation of success, the disclosure of Casteel still does not suggest that a thickness of not more than 1.5 inches is possible but merely discloses a fixture of about 1.7 inches thick. (See Casteel, Col. 3, Ln. 13-15) Thus, there is no motivation to combine the references, there would be no expectation of success, and not all the claimed features are actually disclosed by the cited references. Therefore, the cited references fail to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP 706.02(j) ("To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference[s] ... must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. "). Accordingly, claim 23 is nonobvious in view of the references of record.

Claims 24-28 depend from claim 23 and are not obvious for at least the above reasons and for the additional features recited therein.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) – Entrop & Yonkers

Claims 3, 6-7, 10, 16, and 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Entrop in view of Yonkers. These claims, however, depend from independent claim 1, and, as discussed above, Entrop fails to disclose, suggest or teach all the limitations of claim 1. The Office Action has not suggested that Yonkers corrects the above noted deficiencies in Entrop, nor does Yonkers appear to be able to do so. Accordingly, the combination of Entrop and Yonkers fails to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1. See MPEP 706.02(j) ("To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. ... [Third], the prior art reference[s] ... must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.").

To clarify this point, as comments in the Office Action suggest that Applicant's prior response was misunderstood, the Office Action is suggesting that Entrop discloses certain features of the independent claim 1 and the Yonkers corrects certain deficiencies corresponding to features of claims 3, 6-7, 10, 16, and 18-19. Applicant does not have to address whether

Yonkers does or does not disclose these additional features, however, because as noted above, Entrop does not disclose all the features of claim 1. Therefore, the Office Action has not yet met its burden with respect to claim 1 and any further discussion about what Yonkers does or does not disclose is unnecessary unless Yonkers can also correct the deficiencies in Entrop that have been noted by Applicant. To date, no such suggestion has been made by the Office Action, nor does such a suggestion seem supported. Therefore, the combination of Entrop and Yonkers fails to support a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1, claims 3, 6-7, 10, 16 and 18-19 for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 and for the additional limitations recited therein.

Accordingly, withdrawal of this ground of rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

As all rejections have been addressed, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and allowance of all pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: August 18, 2006

By: /Stephen L. Sheldon/
Stephen L. Sheldon
Registration No. 58,732

Banner & Witcoff, LTD.
Ten South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Tel: (312) 463-5000
Fax: (312) 463-5001